

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in Response to the Office Action dated October 19, 2009.

Claims 11, 12 and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, Claims 11-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thukrai (US Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0195866) in view of Khoo et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0100042) in view of Blasko et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0083444) in view of Sgarlino (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0229893) and further in view of Drake (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078441). Upon careful review of the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

The Office Action notes on page 3 that Thukrai in view of Khoo does not disclose analyzing ad agencies and advertisers. To emphasize this feature, claims 11 and 18 have been amended to further recite that the Ad Center includes a repository unit for storing user information and ad agency or advertiser information.

While Blasko refers to ad agents and advertisers, it does not teach or suggest that ad agency information or advertiser information can be stored in a repository unit in the Ad Center, as claimed. Rather Blasko provides a tool where advertisers or ad agents can search for advertisement spots (referred to as "avails") within a certain time duration. More particularly, Blasko says that its user is an ad agent or advertiser [see paragraph 0025]. The user interacts with a User Interface Device 30 to obtain various data on the "avails", as outlined in FIGs. 2A and 2B. The ad agent receives market segment characteristics 512, a geographical map 522, available addressable units and inventory data 526, along with price

data 534. Accordingly, the ad agent is analyzing demographic data, viewing inventory and obtaining price information for the purpose of making ad placement decisions. The ad agency and advertisers information is not being stored in a repository of the Ad Center, as currently claimed. Accordingly, Blasko cannot achieve the step of analyzing ad agencies and advertisers, as recited in claims 11 and 18.

When combining Blasko with Thukrai, one would couple Blasko's User Interface Device 30 to Thukai's Content Provider 102. Thukrai's system would then provide ad agents/advertisers with the ability to analyze demographic data and make ad placement decisions. There is no suggestion in either reference to provide an Ad Center with a repository unit for storing user information and ad agency or advertiser information, as claimed. Actually, Blasko shows several stages in the process where a selected market segment is unavailable, and the process ends [see decision block 520 of FIG. 2A or decision block 530 of FIG. 2B which feeds back to 520.] When the process terminates prematurely, certainly ad agency or advertisers information is not being stored because the search was unsuccessful. In this regard, Blasko teaches away from storing ad agency or advertise information as currently claimed.

The deficiency is not cured by Khoo which is cited for collecting user's personal and local attributes and transmitting same. Khoo has movie clips with different advertising options. The user's attributes are analyzed to determine which clip should be used for different viewers. Sgarlino is cited for user ad search and follow-up requests. Drake is cited for disclosing software and firmware updates. There is no mention in any of these references to store or analyze ad agent or advertisers information.

In conclusion, Blasko has a system where ad agents or advertisers can analyze demographic data. The references do not teach an Ad Center including a repository unit for storing user information and ad agency or advertiser information. Finally, the references do not suggest such a repository in combination with analyzing ad agencies, advertisers and user information to select personalized and localized ad content for each ICM.

NEW POWER OF ATTORNEY

Attached please find a New Power of Attorney. Please update the Patent Office records to associate the application to Customer No. 89412 so that we receive all future correspondence.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the remaining objections to the claims be withdrawn, that pending Claims 11-25 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 15, 2010

/EHK/

Edwin H. Keusey
(Reg. No. 34,361)

Correspondence Address:

KEUSEY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
420 Jericho Tpke., Suite 324
Jericho, NY 11753
Tel: (516) 934-0951
Fax: (516) 934-0952